



H4

U.S. Department of Justice

Immigration and Naturalization Service

Identifying data deleted in
accordance with
FOIA b(7)(C) - personal privacy

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS
425 Eye Street N.W.
U.S. Court of Appeals Building
Washington, D.C. 20536

File: [REDACTED] Office: HONG KONG

Date: **JAN 03 2002**

IN RE: Applicant: [REDACTED]

Application: Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility under
Section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Immigration and Nationality Act,
8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(9)(B)(v)

IN BEHALF OF APPLICANT:

Public Copy

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision in your case. All documents have been returned to the office which originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or the analysis used in reaching the decision was inconsistent with the information provided or with precedent decisions, you may file a motion to reconsider. Such a motion must state the reasons for reconsideration and be supported by any pertinent precedent decisions. Any motion to reconsider must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider, as required under 8 C.F.R. 103.5(a)(1)(i).

If you have new or additional information which you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reopen. Such a motion must state the new facts to be proved at the reopened proceeding and be supported by affidavits or other documentary evidence. Any motion to reopen must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reopen, except that failure to file before this period expires may be excused in the discretion of the Service where it is demonstrated that the delay was reasonable and beyond the control of the applicant or petitioner. Id.

Any motion must be filed with the office which originally decided your case along with a fee of \$110 as required under 8 C.F.R. 103.7.

FOR THE ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER,
EXAMINATIONS

Robert P. Wiemann
Robert P. Wiemann, Acting Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the Officer in Charge, Hong Kong, and is now before the Associate Commissioner for Examinations on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant is a native and citizen of Taiwan who was found by a consular officer to be inadmissible to the United States under section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(9)(B)(i)(II), for having been unlawfully present in the United States for a period of one year or more. The applicant is the beneficiary of an approved petition for alien relative filed on his behalf by his naturalized United States citizen father. The applicant seeks the above waiver in order to travel to the United States to reside.

The officer in charge concluded that the applicant had failed to establish that extreme hardship would be imposed upon a qualifying relative and denied the application accordingly.

On appeal, counsel asserts that the applicant's father would suffer not only social and emotional hardship if the applicant is not permitted to join him in the United States, but medical and economic hardship as well. Counsel asserts that the applicant's father has chronic bronchitis, hypertension, dizziness and vertigo and will not be able to continue his business in the United States without the applicant's assistance.

The record reflects that the applicant last entered the United States as a visitor for pleasure in December 1997. He remained longer than authorized and was unlawfully present in the United States for a period of one year or more. He departed the United States for Hong Kong in December 1999.

Section 212(a) of the Act states:

CLASSES OF ALIENS INELIGIBLE FOR VISAS OR ADMISSION.-
Except as otherwise provided in this Act, aliens who are inadmissible under the following paragraphs are ineligible to receive visas and ineligible to be admitted to the United States:

* * *

(9) ALIENS PREVIOUSLY REMOVED.-

* * *

(B) ALIENS UNLAWFULLY PRESENT.-

(i) IN GENERAL.-Any alien (other than an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence) who-

* * *

(II) has been unlawfully present in the United States for one year or more, and who again seeks admission within 10 years of the date of such alien's departure from the United States, is inadmissible.

* * *

(v) WAIVER.-The Attorney General has sole discretion to waive clause (i) in the case of an immigrant who is the spouse or son or daughter of a United States citizen or of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, if it is established to the satisfaction of the Attorney General that the refusal of admission to such immigrant alien would result in extreme hardship to the citizen or lawfully resident spouse or parent of such alien. No court shall have jurisdiction to review a decision or action by the Attorney General regarding a waiver under this clause.

Section 212(a)(9)(B) of the Act was amended by the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (IIRIRA). After reviewing the IIRIRA amendments to the Act relating to fraud, misrepresentation and unlawful presence in the United States, and after noting the increased penalties Congress has placed on such activities, including the narrowing of the parameters for eligibility, the re-inclusion of the perpetual bar in some instances, eliminating children as a consideration in determining the presence of extreme hardship, and providing a ground of inadmissibility for unlawful presence after April 1, 1997, it is concluded that Congress has placed a high priority on reducing and/or stopping fraud, misrepresentation and unlawful presence of aliens in the United States.

In Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez, Interim Decision 3380 (BIA 1999), the Board recently stipulated that the factors deemed relevant in determining whether an alien has established "extreme hardship" in waiver proceedings under section 212(i) of the Act include, but are not limited to, the following: (1) the presence of a lawful permanent resident or United States citizen spouse or parent in this country; (2) the qualifying relative's family ties outside the United States; (3) the conditions in the country or countries to which the qualifying relative would relocate and the extent of the qualifying relative's ties in such countries; (4) the financial impact of departure from this country; (5) and finally, significant conditions of health, particularly when tied to an unavailability

of suitable medical care in the country to which the qualifying relative would relocate.

On appeal, counsel submits documentation including a brief, an affidavit from the applicant's lawful permanent resident mother, and a physician's letter concerning the applicant's father. The physician states that the father is sixty-one years old and suffers from hypertension near syncope, dizziness and vertigo. He is unable to work full-time and takes medication to control his blood pressure. The physician concludes that the father needs family support in order to go through further evaluation and diagnostic testing.

The applicant's mother states that she is fifty-five years old and cannot take care of her husband and work in the restaurant they own at the same time. She asserts that although she and her husband have two other children already residing in the United States, they are unable to provide her husband with the full-time care he requires. She states that at this point in her life, she needs all the help she can get and that her hardships would be lessened if the applicant were able to come to the United States.

On appeal, counsel states that the applicant's parents need their business to survive, cannot afford to hire extra help, and require the applicant's presence in the United States so that his mother would be able to provide more care for her husband. Counsel claims that the applicant's siblings are unable to help their parents because one is a full-time student and the other is employed full-time.

In Perez v. INS, 96 F.3d 390 (9th Cir. 1996), the court stated that "extreme hardship" is hardship that is unusual or beyond that which would normally be expected upon deportation. Further, the common results of deportation are insufficient to prove extreme hardship. Also see Hassan v. INS, 927 F.2d 465 (9th Cir. 1991). The uprooting of family and separation from friends does not necessarily amount to extreme hardship but rather represents the type of inconvenience and hardship experienced by the families of most aliens being deported. See Shooshtary v. INS, 39 F.3d 1049 (9th Cir. 1994).

The court held in INS v. Jong Ha Wang, 450 U.S. 139 (1981), that the mere showing of economic detriment to qualifying family members is insufficient to warrant a finding of extreme hardship.

A review of the documentation in the record, when considered in its totality, fails to establish the existence of hardship to the applicant's father caused by separation that reaches the level of extreme as envisioned by Congress if the applicant is not allowed to travel to the United States to reside at this time. Having found the applicant statutorily ineligible for relief, no purpose would be served in discussing whether he merits a waiver as a matter of discretion.

In proceedings for application for a waiver of inadmissibility under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act, the burden of proving eligibility remains entirely with the applicant. See Matter of T--S--Y--, 7 I&N Dec. 582 (BIA 1957). Here, the applicant has not met that burden. Accordingly, the appeal will be dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.